



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

(1843). In a note the author indicates the main lines of the fishing theme as developed in Germany.

The appended list of authorities seems to be comprehensive, though Dr. Hall might well have indicated the source of bibliographical data. One is interested to know whether books on angling and *pisces* generally, like L. R. Albee's in the *Harvard Bibliographies*, no. 51, is of value for bibliographical purposes. The number of secondary articles and books on Sannazaro and others is rather small, but omissions here may be intentional, especially if they contain no matter on the special theme of investigation.¹

The Idylls of Fishermen is a brief and straightforward historical account of the species. The author makes no effort at especial graces of style, or at the exhaustiveness that comes from detailed tracing of 'exact' sources and discursive elaboration of all possible points of relationship. In places, the book has the scrappy effect brought about by the citations from works far apart in date. This is evidently owing to the nature of the subject-matter, for the piscatory shows no gradual and steady development. To have attempted greater things with so limited a field would have been to invite ridicule. One wishes that the author had dwelt more fully on the trend and effect of the contribution of each period, but one is glad to have the work as done.

LOUIS SIGMUND FRIEDLAND.

College of the City of New York.

ELIZABETHAN DRAMA, 1558-1642, by F. E. Schelling; Students' Edition, 2 vols., pp. xliii + 606; x + 685; Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1911; price, \$3.50, net.

THE TUDOR DRAMA, by C. F. T. Brooke; pp. xiii + 461; 10 illustrations; Boston, New York, and Chicago: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1911; price, \$1.50, net.

The most striking change to be noted in the new edition of Professor Schelling's two volumes is in their appearance. By the use of thin paper and the judicious shearing of margins the work has been reduced in size almost beyond recognition, but the pagination remains as before. The result is a book much more attractive to the hand and the eye as well as to the purse of the average student. On all other points the identity is immediately evident. The author in his new

¹Of errata, I have noted only two: Page 133, "Tempect" for "Tempest"; and page 195, 1616 in "Scott's 'Antiquary' (1616)" should be (1816).

preface states that while no part of the book has been rewritten, he has been assisted by the criticism of reviewers and of personal correspondents and has used the opportunity to correct certain errors appearing in the first edition. In particular, as Professor Schelling explains, he has profited by the searching criticism of Mr. W. W. Greg in *The Modern Language Review* (1910); on numerous pages in both volumes he has modified statements, corrected obvious misprints, and added new references to meet Mr. Greg's objections.

In view of the excellent spirit evinced in this procedure, it may be ungracious to express disappointment that the revision has not been more thorough. But it is precisely because the book occupies such an eminent place as an encyclopedia of information concerning the most important period of English literature that one desires the *errata* to become a negligible quantity. Some proof-reading of the first impression was undoubtedly hasty, and most errors occurring in this process have been excided. But not all of even Mr. Greg's suggestions have borne fruit. For example, he pointed out the slip on ii. 442, of *Litteraturbibliothek* for *Litteraturblatt*; on ii. 461, of *Les Débat* for *Les Débuts*; and on ii. 487, of *Manuele* for *Manuale*,—all of which stand uncorrected in the new edition. In this connection it may be remarked as disconcerting to find on ii. 434, and again on ii. 482 the statement that Greg's second volume of *Henslowe's Diary* has not yet appeared, but on ii. 539 a reference to a certain page of this promised second volume. The explanation is that the first two references have not been revised since Greg's new volume was issued.

More complete revision might have remedied other omissions or mistakes of the first edition. Failure to take into account Fuller's important paper on the Dutch version of the Romeo story, and Robertson's volume, *Did Shakespeare Write Titus Andronicus?*, in the body of the text, is not wholly atoned for by the mention of both contributions in the valuable Bibliographical Essay appended to volume II. Then Professor Schelling's impatience with the zeal of Teutonic or other scholars in pursuit of source and date problems is expressed rather frequently; however, his own dating of familiar plays is not altogether consistent with itself. To illustrate, on i. 244, a marginal title dates Greene's *James the Fourth* at 1590; a similar title just fourteen pages later dates the same play as of 1592. Similarly on i. 294, it is stated that the older *King Leir* was "published for the first time in 1605, and undoubtedly because of the recent appearance of Shakespeare's *Tragedy of King Lear*"; while six pages farther on, Shakespeare's *King Lear* is dated 1606. Again, i. 300, *Lear*

is said to have been acted at court in November, 1606, when the actual date is December 26, 1606; and on i. 346, Yarrington's *Two Tragedies in One* is three times miscalled *Two Murders in One*. Each of these errors is admittedly minute, but their detection at once raises the question whether numerous others of similar import have not escaped discovery, and the authority of the book is thus weakened. In other words, many students of the Elizabethan drama have felt that this was a notable exemplar of sane, thorough, and comprehensive American scholarship save in one particular—it contained too many inaccuracies of detail. These inaccuracies have not disappeared in the second printing.

Herewith ends our fault-finding. After all is said and done the book remains not only a masterly interpretation, but the most illuminating history of Elizabethan drama. Its zest of attack, its literary flavor, and the real joy that the author obtains from reading and expounding these old plays, make the heaviness of his labors seem light.

It may be unwise to compare Professor Brooke's much simpler and less pretentious volume with Professor Schelling's matured product, but to do so is the inevitable consequence of their issuance during the same year by the same house, covering much the same field, and employing somewhat the same method of treatment. Indeed, the resemblance goes farther. Professor Schelling's sub-title runs: "A History of the Drama in England from the Accession of Queen Elizabeth to the Closing of the Theaters, to which is prefixed a Résumé of the Earlier Drama from its Beginnings." Mr. Brooke puts his more concisely: "A History of English National Drama to the Retirement of Shakespeare". Moreover, a casual comparison of the two tables of contents will bring out numerous similarities in method and arrangement. Thus by the flattery of imitation the younger scholar seems to have invited comparison.

That Mr. Brooke's purview does not extend beyond Shakespeare's retirement or even beyond the death of Elizabeth in 1603, is indicated in the title. Another limitation to his field as compared with Schelling's, is that he is little concerned with the London playhouses, to which Schelling devotes an entire chapter, or with the conditions under which the plays were actually presented to Elizabethan audiences. Some ten drawings, chiefly illustrating the performance of the earlier sacred drama, assist in clarifying the text; but there is little discussion of the subject, and except in recounting the War of the Theatres, we have almost no mention of the rival acting companies. The apparent aim of the writer is to present a clear account of the genesis and growth of

English drama under the Tudor sovereigns, and to classify the extant plays into a small number of easily recognized types. In making his divisions he has been even less influenced by considerations of chronology than has Dr. Schelling, unhesitatingly placing his comment on Lyly and Peele before that on *Gorboduc*, and discussing *Romeo and Juliet* before *Tamburlaine*, since logic demands these reversals from the customary order. On the other hand, he distinguishes in the chapter headings more sharply than does Schelling between comedy, tragedy, and history.

But the wisdom of massing in one group all plays dealing with English or foreign historical events, the present critic would seriously question. In large part our justification for employing the term "history" in the dramatic sense comes from Heminge and Condell's use of it to designate in the first folio of Shakespeare ten definitely national dramas. Furthermore, it is a commonplace of knowledge that the vogue of history plays sprang from the fervid patriotism that so characterizes the latter part of Elizabeth's reign, and the strident note of nationalism is a distinguishing mark of the *genre*. The fact that their source material is somewhat similar in character fails to justify the consideration of *Selimus* or *Antony and Cleopatra* along with *Edward the Second* and *Sir Thomas More*.

A more serious general criticism finds origin in the author's fondness for the minuter problems of special research. It is always difficult for the enthusiastic investigator to let slip an opportunity of contributing to the world's knowledge. Yet from its very nature this volume appeals not so much to the trained specialist as to the tyro, who will as a rule find it a safe and convenient work of reference. In the handling of such topics as the purport of Lyly's *Endymion* or Jonson's connection with the War of the Theatres, the advocate's zeal outruns the historian's discretion so that immature students are likely to confuse the real issues of the case. The redeeming side of this evil tendency is that Mr. Brooke's judgment is usually on the side of sound scholarship, and his conservatism in rejecting, for instance, many of Professor Penniman's identifications of character in Jonson's allegories, will commend itself to judicious critics more than the plea of Schelling for the opposing side.

Another case where Mr. Brooke seems to have a mistaken sense of values results in the practical obscuration of Shakespeare's relative greatness among his contemporaries. After all, what excuse can one offer for the detailed analysis of *motif* and plot structure in the crude drama produced, let us say, before 1590, except as an introduction to Shakespeare?

Yet this book seems to slight a large number of Shakespearian plays. Such dramatic masterpieces as *Much Ado* and *Othello* receive only passing notice, while the discussion of *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, which Mr. Brooke rightly terms "a miserable piece of sloppy sensationalism", occupies about four pages.

The most valuable feature of the whole work is the careful and reasonably complete bibliographies placed at the end of each chapter and admirably massed for the service of the eye. A fairly simple classification enables one easily to find in black-faced type the name of a particular play, followed first by names and dates of various editions, and then by important discussions of the subject. Additions may always be made to such bibliographies. Occasionally one misses an important specific reference to such general works as those of Fleay or as Greg's commentary on Henslowe. In a particular case, that of *The True Chronicle History of King Leir* (p. 350), Brooke lends countenance to a hypothetical first edition of 1594, while he fails to set down reprints of 1766 (Steevens: *Wm. Shakespeare, Twenty of His Plays*, vol. IV); of 1779 (John Nichols: *Six Old Plays*, etc.), and even of 1908 (Malone Society); or important discussions by Wilfrid Perrett in *The Story of King Lear from Geoffrey of Monmouth to Shakespeare* (*Palæstra*, No. 35, pp. 94-121, 1904), and by Greg, in reviewing Lee's edition of the play for the *Modern Language Review* (V, 515-519, 1910). There is reason to believe that such omissions are uncommon. One reprehensible habit of the author, however, is to append to certain plays merely the direction, "See bibliography in *The Shakespeare Apocrypha*." This extremely exasperating trick may have been adopted from Fleay; but from whatever source it arose, the busy reader, who may have left his copy of Mr. Brooke's earlier work in the office instead of on the bookshelf, will call down imprecations on the author's head for not reprinting three or four lines.

What has been said in the way of criticism does not indicate any large degree of dissatisfaction with the work. It is a peculiarly attractive and useful volume to all interested in the English drama, and its every page indicates industry and common sense. Its good qualities have been emphasized so strongly in published comments on the book during the past year, that the notice of a few possible shortcomings will not detract from its excellent reputation.

One limitation to the permanent value of both books under review lies in the constant discovery of new facts and new interpretations of long established facts concerning the topics with which they deal. Of all English literature just now the Elizabethan period seems to be the most fertile field of in-

vestigation, attracting as it has done the tireless labors of Chambers, Greg, McKerrow, and other members of a remarkable group of scholars in the mother country; of smaller groups in four or five of the large American universities; and of a well-organized body of specialists in Germany. Not to mention various editions of Shakespeare and Jonson, two notable products of scholarship in this field, *viz.*, M. Feuillerat's *John Lyly* and Mr. J. T. Murray's *English Dramatic Companies, 1558-1642*, have been issued too recently to receive fair attention from either Schelling or Brooke. The final word in the history of Elizabethan drama will not be uttered for many years to come.

ROBERT ADGER LAW.

University of Texas.